This characteristic is also clearly revealed in a kind of love token giving for which there is no designation in German and which is therefore best called by its native name "soregus. This is introduced by drinking a toast. With the words: "ũ soreb" or [319] "sore //gams," i.e. "this is sorewater," a drink is handed to the chosen one (male or female) from which the giver has first taken a sip. A boy who entered into a closer relationship to an old Hottentot in this fashion, received a horse and several sheep and goats as presents. He survived his benefactor, but still feels obligated to make a present to the man's children -- twenty years may have passed in the meantime -- even though no one could force him to do this. Women also enter into this kind of relationship with each other. Without asking for a return favor, a woman presented her favorite, a little girl, several goats. Years later she received a sack of coffee in return. Characteristic for the sore relationship is the fact that there is no legal protection as would apply in trading but that it is based on mutual trust. A review of the driving forces behind this giving never gave me reason to assume that avarice was involved. The joy of giving, a characteristic of the people, is in any case one of the main springs of the sore custom. Whether that was the original one or whether sexual attraction has always been involved (see below) I do not dare to decide.

2. Sexual Relations

Sexual relations among the Hottentots are no longer regulated as formerly in the interest of the tribal community by ethical rules. Except for those families that hold faithfully to the teachings of the mission, no one is shocked by even the freest relationships. Formerly ethical strictness was also found among the Hottentots. Eye-witnesses of the times thirty to forty years ago report that a girl who had sinned was whipped by her parents with straps in the presence of the guilty man and that the man was then given the same punishment in the presence of the girl. Another girl got the same treatment when the women who were massaging her found striated marks on her of an old, secret pregnancy. Today the Hottentot mothers think differently. The morals of married people are not any better. The sore relationship mentioned above, although in most cases completely honorable, can also mean a concealed agreement to an intimate relationship outside of wedlock.

Magic sometimes stands in the service of lechery. /na/m/na/m means enchanting to secure someone's love. The mouthpiece of a pipe [320] is secretly smeared with the contents of the medicine box. The man smokes

2: Schapera E-4, 5 (no date) 1930
FX13 Hottentot FX13
Nama

836 of the camp, and thus received the stamp of publicity and recognized usage.[1] Nowadays the restrictions on premarital intercourse are more loosely observed, and the lovers are apparently not punished. [864] Schultze even goes so far as to say that boys and girls often have sexual intercourse while they are still playing children's games, and no special notice of this is taken by their elders.[2] Should pregnancy 848 follow, however, the father of the child is expected to marry the mother. Even if he does not do so, he is responsible for the sustenance of the child while it is being weaned, and has to provide the mother [684] with some cattle or money for this purpose. If he refuses, he is taken before the tribal council and compelled to do so, and may even be flogged. The payments cease when the child has been weaned. It then belongs to the father, and may be taken away by him. Premarital children are said to have the same rights of inheritance from their father as those born in wedlock.[3]

684 Rape is severely penalized. If the victim is a child, the violator, according to Wandres, suffers the death penalty; if she is a virgin, or even a girl who had previously been deflowered, he is thrashed and all his property confiscated; while if she is a married woman her husband has the right to kill him without fear of retaliation. 684 Incest, between either parents and children, brother and sister, or 835 even the children of brothers and sisters ("Geschwister") is punished by death.[4]

● 572 The occurrence of homosexuality among the Hottentots is denied 838 by both Wandres and Fritsch.[5] Kurt Falk, however, maintains that it is fairly common, among both men and women, and especially among young married women.[6] There exists among the Naman a

[1] Schultze, *Aus Namaland und Kalahari*, 298, 3[illegible]; cf. Hahn, "Die Nama-Hottentotten," 332.
[2] Op. cit., 309.
[3] Kohler, "Das Recht der Hottentotten," 348; Wandres, "Ueber das Recht der Naman," 669; Vedder, "The Nama," 144, 145.
[4] Loc. cit. Intercourse between direct cousins, here said to be treated as incest, is now apparently no longer condemned, as at the present time they may even marry; while marriage between cross-cousins, also included by Wandres under his definition of incest, was always permitted. Kolb (op. cit., 73) also affirms that incest, by which he means especially intercourse between parents and children, is punished by death; while Hahn, commenting upon the myth relating how the hero-god Heitsi-Eibib committed incest with his mother, says: "The laws and customs of the Namaquas are against incest in any form. In the last thirty years only three cases, and those among the so-called Orlam tribes, have happened. Here, certainly, we have the fact of the contact with civilized races having proved fatal to the morals of the Aborigines. When these cases happened there was throughout Great Namaqualand a general outcry against the criminals; they were punished most severely, thrown out of society, and a gloom cast over the whole tribe to which they belonged" (*Tsuni-||Goam*, 135).
[5] Wandres, loc. cit.; Fritsch, in F. Karsch-Haack, *Das gleichgeschlechtliche Leben der Naturvölker* (1911), p. 133.
[6] "Homosexualität bei den Eingeborenen in Südwest-Afrika," *Geschlecht und Gesellschaft*, xiii (1925–6), 209–10.

2: Schapera E-4, 5 (no date) 1930
FX13 Hottentot FX13
Nama

practice whereby two individuals, either of the same or of opposite sex, will enter into a specially intimate bond of association, *soregus*, with each other. This is initiated by one of the parties drinking from a bowl of water (or nowadays often coffee), and then handing the rest of the liquid to the other to drink, with the words: *sore-//gamsa ure*, take the *sore* water, or *sore-//gamsa are*, drink the *sore* water. As a rule the relationship thus entered upon primarily implies deep friendship and mutual assistance, especially in economic matters. But, according to Falk, it is also used as a means of establishing a homosexual relationship, especially by boys, who jealously watch over each other. The customary form of homosexual practice is mutual masturbation, among both men and women (*oa !huru* or simply *!huru* in the case of men, *!goe-ugu* in the case of women); pedication (coitus in anum) between men, and the use of an artificial penis between women, are also found, but more rarely. Falk mentions also three cases known to him of men who were confirmed sexual inverts. Unfortunately he gives no concrete data as to the public attitude either towards such men or towards homosexuality in general, but as far as can be gathered from his short account, homosexual practices are regarded somewhat as a matter of custom. How far this is the correct view cannot be determined, as no other writer gives any positive information on the subject.

Solitary masturbation (*gui-guisen*, to make oneself stiff) is also found; and, according to Fritsch, it is so frequent among girls as almost to deserve the name of a national custom ("Landessitte"). No special secret is made of it, he says, and the people even speak of it in tales and legends as if it were quite an ordinary occurrence.[1] He goes so far as to venture the suggestion, often advanced also by other writers, that the elongation of the labia minora found in many Hottentot women may be due to this practice,[2] but, as we have already seen, there is little doubt that this hypertrophy is a purely physiological condition.

Wandres mentions also that occasional cases of bestiality are found, which, if they come to the notice of the tribal council, result in "exemplary punishment".[3] He does not specify the nature of this punishment, nor does he give any instances known to him of such abnormal practices.

[1] *Eingeborenen Süd-Afrika's*, 351; cf. Falk, op. cit., 211.
[2] Op. cit., 283.
[3] Loc. cit.

2: Sclapera E-4, 5 (no date) 1930
FX13 Hottentot FX13
Nama

and during the day, when the cattle are at pasture, he is fed upon this milk. The little boys early begin to herd the goats, every boy being entrusted with a number, whose milk he may use. It is not long before he is able to catch a beast with great dexterity out of the running flock, sit under or behind it, and milk it into his mouth. The little girls remain always with their mother, and gradually learn to assist her in the daily household tasks; to see that a standing supply of firewood is maintained, to prepare the food and the ointments for the body, to fetch water, to make the reed mats, and keep the hut in repair, and so on.[1]

Among themselves the children play games of various kinds. In some they imitate the doings of their elders—catch mice, for example, put them into a small kraal, then castrate all the males excepting one, which is kept as the ram of the herd. They prepare small bows and arrows for themselves, with which they hunt small animals such as lizards, mice, and birds; make clay figures of human beings, cattle and other animals which they burn in the fire; and compete with one another in throwing sticks to a distance, concealing stones in their hands, and so on.

Children of about the same age, both boys and girls, who grow up together in the same place, regard one another as "mates" (*/gui //han*) for the rest of their lives. Often enough they do not address one another by name, but use the intimate terms *aotse* (voc. of *aob*, man or husband) and *axiase* (voc. of *xais*, woman or wife). As children they play together in bands, usually closely organized for a year or more. They elect for themselves a "captain", who chooses his "lieutenant"; both have younger boys as their personal servants. They direct all the games and other activities, and even settle the love disputes of the others. Disobedience of their orders or such misbehaviour as sexual intercourse is punished with a fine of tobacco or food, often enough a fairly severe penalty when food is none too plentiful. The adults are content to leave in their hands the regulation of their coevals, thereby strengthening this system of self-government of the young. In later life the close bond between age-mates remains unbroken, and, indeed, the whole spirit of their relations is one of deep friendship and mutual obligation throughout life.[2]

In social life generally age carries prestige, and differences in status are often marked to some extent by relative age. Every junior is

[1] Schultze, op. cit. 300; *idem*, "Südwestafrika," 207; Schinz, op. cit., 98.
[2] Schultze, *Namaland und Kalahari*, 308–15; cf. Hoernlé, "Social Value of Water," 522–3.

2: Schapera E-4, 5 (no date) 1930
FX13 Hottentot FX13
Nama

or camp hungry, especially if of the same tribe; he is welcome, even in the owner's absence, to help himself to whatever there is.

It is customs such as these which have given rise to the use of the term "communism" in regard to the property laws of the Hottentots. It should by now be evident, however, that underlying the undoubtedly far-reaching liberality of the people there is always a clear recognition of private property rights. The Hottentot shares his food with others because he has the right to dispose of it, not because they have an equally legitimate claim to it; and this applies still more to live stock and objects of material culture.

This point is borne out by the special reciprocal relationship, *soregus*, to which reference has already been made.[1] This relationship, also known as *magus*, to give one another, must be ceremonially entered upon between the two persons concerned, and implies, as we have seen, mutual obligation and assistance in all aspects of life—they may refuse each other nothing. In practice this applies especially to property, where each may demand or take from the other whatever he pleases, and may not be refused.

Tindall gives a description of this custom which illustrates rather drastically its full implications in regard to property.[2] "It is usual among them [the Naman] to carry on a kind of 'maatschappy' or partnership. Two men, living perhaps three or four hundred miles apart, 'make mates,' the understanding is that each may take from the other whatever he pleases. They profess to believe that this is a very profitable kind of arrangement, and it is difficult to persuade them of the contrary. The following instance will illustrate the extent to which this 'magu' or 'give-each-other' system proceeds. A poor man at Nisbet Bath, had, by diligence, obtained a horse and gun, he had a good hat, a very decent suit of clothes, a warm overcoat, and his wife had a tolerably respectable wardrobe. One fine morning a mate, with whom he had in an evil hour entered into partnership, turned up from the borders of Damaraland, and claimed as his right, horse, gun, hat, clothes, coat, and all his wife's apparel, except her undress, and with these he departed with true native sang froid, leaving the other his tattered garments and riddled hat, which had been so repeatedly patched, that it was almost impossible to discern the original stuff. The probable sequel to this affair would be that the man would return his mate's visit, who would either manage to avoid

[1] Cf. Schultze, op. cit., 318–19; Wanderer, "Ueber das Recht der Namen," 68a.
[2] Op. cit., 40–2.

4[see cat. 116, p. 243. —Analyst]

2: Schapera E-4, 5 (no date) 1930
FX13 Hottentot FX13
Nama

425 him or get all his valuable cattle out of the way; and yet not the least suspicion would be awakened that there was any villainy or 572 dishonesty in the matter."

Wikar, himself a party to such a compact, speaks of it in far more generous terms.[1] "An old father and captain of the Bushmen (*sic*) named Ougaa came to me this evening and proposed to take me on as his bond brother ('*opligtbroer*'), to which I was agreeable, but I said that I had no cattle to give him. He replied however that tobacco would do just as well as cattle from me; if I got cattle during his lifetime then we could give them to one another, if not he would still be my brother and never leave me in the lurch but would help and be faithful to me. And this was indeed the case, for I must acknowledge before God and man that he was to me not merely as a brother but even as a father in all my sorrow, distress, hunger and bodily danger. According to Hottentot practice I might now refuse him nothing for which he asked me and which I had, I must help him and stand beside him in everything, and so too must he act towards me."

The information relating to this custom is on the whole too fragmentary to enable one to determine its full function in Hottentot life. That it is not limited to exchange of goods is shown by the [838 fact, as we have seen, that it easily lends itself to homosexual practices, 837] where the two persons are of the same sex, and possibly even to wife-exchange, if Wikar's description of the latter can be regarded as another illustration of the usages associated with the *sorequa*. But nowhere is any analysis made of the respective social status of the two persons concerned, of the circumstances under which the compact is entered upon, of the extent to which it is practised, and of all its implications. In the absence of such an analysis, and even of the full concrete data upon which it can be based, speculation as to the real meaning of the custom can only be tentative. Tindall's description may possibly furnish one of the underlying motives, in the sense that the compact may be regarded as a means of ensuring protection and hospitality when one is visiting a distant locality; but there are obviously other motives inducing people to enter into such a relationship, and the custom is well worth studying in more detail than has yet been done. As far as the present discussion concerning property is concerned, the very fact that such a system of exchange and even exploitation as is implied in the compact must be

[1] Op. cit., 85–6.

2: Schapera E-4, 5 (no date) 1930
FX13 Hottentot FX13
Nama

425
592

ceremonially initiated between two special individuals is sufficient argument against the existence of communism among the Hottentots.

425
604

Somewhat akin to the *awgus*, from the economic point of view, is the *//nuri //gub*, the exchange of goods between a man and his sister's son. Here, however, as we have seen, the material advantages are all in favour of the nephew. This economic relationship is based directly on a kinship status, and therefore allows us to see the exchange of goods in a wider social setting, as part of a general pattern of behaviour. The privileged position of the nephew in regard to his mother's brother is due to the respect a man must show towards his sister; and the uneven economic reciprocity between the two former can be regarded as one means of expressing the nature of the ties connecting them. Here again this relationship, with the special rights of exploitation it confers in regard to property, is an argument against the existence of communism.

421

It is hardly necessary to stress any further the fact that the economic life of the Hottentots is really based upon the notion of private property. The problem now arises whether property belongs to the individual or to the family as a whole. Wandres categorically states that an individual owns nothing but his *ons*, soul or breath. All objects of common use—clothes, weapons, implements, and utensils—as well as the hut and the live stock are the collective property of the family. The individual has only the usufruct of, e.g. his clothes and his weapons, and has not the right to dispose of them or of anything else without the consent or knowledge of the rest of the family.[1] Vedder repeats this assertion in terms that are somewhat confusing: "Generally speaking we may say that the individual possesses nothing but is the usufructuary of what the family possesses. This even includes clothes and things for daily use. Under personal property one understands the possession of cattle. A child even may receive one or more goats from his father and he uses their milk. He has the right to milk such goats without permission, and their progeny are his property. Where natural conditions make it possible every person—man, wife, child—possesses a few goats, sheep or even cattle. When these are to be sold it becomes manifest that this personal property continues to be regarded as family property, because in such cases the whole family and not the individual decides whether there should be a sale or not."[2]

1 "Ueber das Recht der Namas," 182–3.
2 "The Nama," 144.